

Application S/N 10/806,992
Amendment dated: March 23, 2006
Response to Office Action dated: December 14, 2005

CE12409JME

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-20 remain pending in the application, as claims 5 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice. In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-6, 9-11 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0165860 to Wang, et al. (Wang). Claims 2, 3, 7, 12, 13 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,919,712 to Herron, et al. (Herron). In addition, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0041041 to Hetzer (Hetzer). Finally, claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0008952 to Kragl (Kragle).

A brief summary of the Wang reference may be helpful here. Wang discloses an optical luminescent display device (30) that includes an optical fiber (32) having one or more notches (34) (see FIG. 1 and paragraph 0046). The notch (34) contains a luminescent material (36), such as a phosphor or fluorescent substance (see FIG. 1 and paragraph 0047). In operation, radiation is provided through the optical fiber (32) so that it communicates with the luminescent material (36), causing the luminescent material (36) to *emit* visible light (see paragraph 0050).

Independent claims 1, 11 and 17 have been amended to clarify that the light directing portions are non-luminescent and direct light to a display structure in a non-random manner. Support for these amendments can be found in paragraph 0025. No new matter has been added in view of these amendments. In contrast with the present invention, Wang relies on luminescent material to emit light out of the sides of an optical fiber. The use of this type of material is more expensive and more difficult for

Application S/N 10/806,992
Amendment dated: March 23, 2006
Response to Office Action dated: December 14, 2005

CE12409JME

manufacturing processes than the use of simple transparent light-directing portions.

None of the other cited references show the claimed invention, either.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that independent claims 1, 11 and 17 are patentable over the prior art. Applicants also believe that those claims that depend from these independent claims are now patentable, in view of both their dependence from these claims and their independent patentability. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Application S/N 10/806,992
Amendment dated: March 23, 2006
Response to Office Action dated: December 14, 2005

CE12409JME

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department – MD 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: 

Larry G. Brown
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

Telephone:(954) 723-4295
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871